

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In response to the Examiner's Office Action of April 13, 2005 the Applicant submits the accompanying Amendment to the claims and the below Remarks directed thereto.

### ***Specification***

The Applicant has amended Pages 1 and 2 of the specification and replaced the US Docket numbers with the corresponding US Patent Application Serial Numbers. The Applicant submits that these amendments introduce no new matter.

### ***Regarding Amendment***

Claims 1-47 as filed are currently pending in the present application. In the Amendment:

independent claim 1 is amended to recite that the slitting mechanism comprises a rotating carousel of four rotating slitting shafts arranged about a central support shaft extending between the end plates, with each slitting shaft having at least one slit arranged along its length in a predetermined position different from those of the slitters of the other slitting shafts. Support for this amendment can be found at page 40, line 38-page 41, line 9 and in Fig. 12 of the present application and in pending dependent claims 3 and 6;

claim 2 is amended to conform with amended claim 1 and to specify that the motor is carried by one of the end plates. Support for this amendment can be found at page 41, lines 3-4 and in Fig. 12 of the present application;

claim 3 is cancelled in conformance with amended claim 1;

claim 4 is amended to replace "cutting disk" with --slitter--;

claim 5 is amended to dependent from claim 4 and to omit recitation already presented in claim 4;

claim 6 is cancelled in conformance with amended claim 1;

claim 7 is amended to clarify that the slitting mechanism is configured to engage into a selected positions and so that the position determine the output wallpaper width(s);

claims 8-11 are amended to replace "blade" with --transverse cutter--. Support for this amendment can be found at page 41, lines 10-13 of the present specification;

claim 12 is cancelled in accordance with the amendment to independent claim 1;

claim 14 is amended to omit recitation already presented in claim 13;

claim 16 is amended to clarify that the belt is external to one of the end plates which carries the belt. Support this amendment can be found at page 40, lines 34-36 of the present specification;

claim 17 is amended clarify that the slitting mechanism is configured to perform the cutting motion in response to a processor signal and so that the cutting motion determines the output wallpaper length;

claims 18-47 are cancelled;  
claims 12, 13 and 15 are unchanged.

It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments do not add new matter to the present application.

***Regarding Claim Objections***

***Claim 2***

It is respectfully submitted that above-described amendment of claim 2 provides the correction required by the Examiner.

***Claim 4***

It is respectfully submitted that above-described amendment of claim 4 provides the correction required by the Examiner.

***Claim 5***

With respect to the "cutting disks", it is respectfully submitted that above-described amendment of claim 5 to depend from claim 4 and to omit recitation already presented in claim 4 provides the correction required by the Examiner.

With respect to "the selected shaft", it is respectfully submitted that proper antecedent basis is given in amended (and pending) claim 5 which recites that "each shaft is positionable such that each slitter carried by a selected shaft enters a corresponding groove of the guide roller".

***Claim 6***

It is respectfully submitted that above-described cancellation of claim 6 renders the objection thereto moot.

***Claim 8***

It is respectfully submitted that above-described amendment of claim 8 (and claims 9-11) provides the correction required by the Examiner.

***Claim 14***

It is respectfully submitted that above-described amendment of claim 14 to omit recitation already presented in claim 13 provides the correction required by the Examiner.

***Claim 16***

It is respectfully submitted that above-described amendment of claim 16 provides the correction required by the Examiner.

***Claims 7 and 17-34, 38 and 42-46***

With respect to claims 7 and 17, it is respectfully submitted that above-described amendment of these claims to specify the configuration of the slitting mechanism in relation to the recited functions provides sufficient further structure of the slitting mechanism, as required by the Examiner.

With respect to claims 18-34, 38 and 42-46, it is respectfully submitted that above-described cancellation of these claims renders the objections thereto moot.

***Regarding 35 USC 112, second paragraph Rejections***

It is respectfully submitted that above-described cancellation of claims 35-37, 39-41 and 47 renders the clarity rejections thereof moot.

***Regarding 35 USC 102(b) Rejections***

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of amended independent claim 1, and claims 2, 4, 5, 7 and 17 dependent therefrom, is not disclosed by any of Coburn (US 4,142,455), Nielsen et al. (US 4,885,964), Adami (US Re. 35,345) and Cameron et al. (US 1,570,940), for at least the following reasons.

In the present invention, the slitter module 1200 incorporates a slitter gang of four slitter rollers 1224-1230 about a central shaft 1232 in a rotating carousel configuration. Each slitter roller has rotating cutting disks 1238 positioned to penetrate the wallpaper when the slitter rollers are rotated into position. The disks are provided at different positions on each slitter roller, as illustrated in Fig. 12 of the present application, so as to allow cutting of the wallpaper at different widths (see page 40, line 38-page 41, line 9 of the present specification).

None of the cited references, in Coburn, Nielsen, Adami and Cameron, disclose, or suggest, such a predetermined arrangement of slitters on four slitter rollers in a rotating carousel configuration. This is because, each of these cited references is directed to providing cutting mechanisms having adjustable blade arrangements, as follows.

Coburn discloses turrets 20, 22 each having blade shafts 32,34 and 36,38 with adjustable blades, with the turrets positioned along different parts of the path of the paperboard to be cut. The turrets are provided with two blade shafts so that one may be operated whilst the other one is not operated, which allows the blades of the non-operational blade shafts to be adjusted for the next cutting run (see col. 2, line 30-col. 3, line 42 of Coburn).

Nielsen discloses arbors 12,14 each having circular knives 13 and 15. The distance between the arbors is adjustable so that as the knives are worn through use, they can be brought closer together to maintain a cutting depth, until replacement is necessary (see col. 3, line 63-col. 4, line 55).

Adami discloses two pairs of cutting rollers 32,33 and 34,35 each having adjustable cutting tools 37,38 and 39,40, with the rollers positioned along different parts of the path of the cardboard to be cut. The two pairs of cutting rollers are provided so that one may be operated whilst the other one is not operated, which allows the position of the cutting tools of the non-operational rollers to be adjusted using the forks 200,200' for the next order (see col. 5, lines 24-28, col. 8, lines 29-38, col. 10, lines 45-64 of Adami).

Cameron discloses two sets of slitting elements each having adjustable shear-cutters 2 and 3. The two sets are provided so that one may be operated whilst the other one is not operated, which allows the shear-cutters of the non-operational set to be adjusted for the next cutting run (see lines 34-88 of the first page of Cameron).

Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not provide an arrangement of four slitter shafts each having a predetermined, but different, arrangement of slitters, from reading the disclosures of Coburn, Nielsen, Adami and Cameron.

Therefore, the subject matter of amended independent claim 1, and claims 2, 4, 5 and 7-17 dependent therefrom, is not disclosed or suggested by any one of Coburn, Nielsen, Adami and Cameron.

***Regarding 35 USC 103(a) Rejections***

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of claims 5 and 8-16, dependent from amended claim 1, is not taught or suggested by Cameron or Coburn in view of any one or more of Carter (EP 594306), Yamaguchi (US 2003/0070753), Kwasny et al. (US 2002/0118990), Kawakami (JP 2000-15596), and Scott (US 2003/0033922), because none of these further cited references teach or suggest a predetermined arrangement of slitters on four slitter rollers in a rotating carrousel configuration.

Therefore, the subject matter of amended independent claim 1, and claims 2, 4, 5 and 7-17 dependent therefrom, is not taught or suggested by any one either Coburn or Cameron taken alone or in combination with any one or more of Carter, Yamaguchi, Kwasny, Kawakami and Scott.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections and rejections have been traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,  
Applicants:




---

KIA SILVERBROOK



---

TOBIN ALLEN KING



---

JANETTE FAYE LEE

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia  
Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)  
Telephone: +612 9818 6633  
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762